

From owner-qrp-1@netcom.com Sat Dec 17 18:17:09 1994
From: bob.berlyn@chowda.com (Bob Berlyn)
Subject: 30-40 Problem Question ?
Date: Sat, 17 Dec 1994 09:54:00 GMT
Message-Id: <9412171501289678@chowda.com>

Hello All,

I just got my 30-40 done. I built it with all the mods from the most recent issue of 72.

Installed 2N3553 Final, Q6

Installed 7.5V Zener for better TX mixer supply voltage, it's now 7.14v.

Installed 2N2222 for Q4 & Q5

Replaced the .01 Cap between the T-R bridge diodes with a 47Pf.

Problem is with the L0 Freq, I guess. I cant get the rig into the part of the band I want. Since most of the action on 30 meters seems to be on the low end of the band I wanted to set my 30-40 up for about 10.102 as the bottom end.

I had to remove a turn from L1 and the lowest Freq I can obtain is 10.129 Mhz.

I added a 10 Pf Cap in Parallel to L1 and got it down to 10.123 Mhz, not good enough.

I added a 18 PF Cap and got it down to 10.119, better, but the transmitter becomes unstable when I try to drive it over about 950 millawatts. I wanted to get a watt and a quarter if I could and it is stable in the last two examples.

I tried unwinding another turn from L1 but than the Freq goes way to low.

I have seen some postings in the past about this problem with the 30-40 but, cant remember what the cure is.

Can anyone help ?

Hope to see you on 30 Mtr QRP soon. Thanks

Bob

* CMPQwk #1.4* UNREGISTERED EVALUATION COPY

From owner-qrp-l@netcom.com Sat Dec 17 16:50:53 1994
Date: Sat, 17 Dec 1994 10:05:19 -0800 (PST)
From: "John W. Olson" <olson@crl.com>
Subject: <didn't bother with a subject>
Message-Id: <Pine.SUN.3.91.941217100435.12283B-1000000@crl5.crl.com>

Subscribe

From owner-qrp-l@netcom.com Sat Dec 17 11:18:48 1994
Date: Sat, 17 Dec 1994 10:11:09 -0330 (NST)
From: Robert Gobrick <bgobrick@random.ucs.mun.ca>
Subject: Re: balunless Clark
Message-Id: <Pine.3.87.9412171009.B28229-01000000@random.ucs.mun.ca>

Hi Dave - saw your comments on the Z-match antenna tuner - after reading some of Bill Orr's columns in CQ recently the Z-match looked interesting. I was wondering where you got your info to build one? Also I see there is an outfit (I think in Southern US) selling a commercial version of the Z-match - first I've seen. Have you heard anyone using it? I always keep saying to myself that there MUST be some loss through my MFJ tuner when I use it's internal 4:1 balun at QRP work and either an old Johnson Viking Matchbox or the Z-match would be a better way to go considering they are more "closely coupled" to the 450 ohm balanced feedline.

It seems your experiments so far with the Z-match doesn't prove that out yet. Anyway I'd like to keep posted on your progress. Any efficiency improvement in the antenna system will help out my 6 element balanced feedline 40 meter yagi... ;-) when using it QRP.

72 and thanks Bob V01DRB/WA6ERB

From owner-qrp-l@netcom.com Sat Dec 17 23:35:28 1994
Date: Sat, 17 Dec 1994 17:54:01 -0700 (MST)
From: Rick Zabrodski <zabrodsk@med.ucalgary.ca>
Subject: Re: balunless Clark
Message-Id: <Pine.SUN.3.91.941217175023.16899B-1000000@ume>

I have a z match tuner and two conventional "link" coupled tuners....home made.....they all work as good or better than any of my 3 commercial t tuner with balun designs. (Yes, I own too many tuners!) The z match is not as easy to use (more finicky) but seems to match a greater impedance range. But, what do I know.....just my .72 cents

Dr. Rick Zabrodski BSc, MD, CCFP(E) * VE6GK
EMAIL: zabrodsk@med.ucalgary.ca *
Packet: VE6GK@VE6YYC.#cgy.ab.can.na * "Power is no substitute
Phone: (403) 271-5123 Fax: 225-1276 * for skill."

On Fri, 16 Dec 1994, David Johnson wrote:

> Hi gang:
>
> I thought Clark's comments about his balun-less success were
> rather interesting. One question: do you use a tuner now, where
> there was none used with the balun? Hmmm, my MFJ-901B is a
> great tuner for making many of my antennas multibanded, and the
> ones with balanced feed make use of the tuner's balun. I tried
> a z-match (homebrew) tuner, which has no balun and links to the
> antenna system by link coupling a coil. It doesn't seem to work
> very well, but I'm not going to blame the designer just yet, as
> it may be faulty construction (!?). But it just "don't hear"
> like through the 901B, even though it allows me to null the SWR.
> Maybe I need to experiment some with the number of turns on the
> link!
>
> Ok, back to the bench! Keep them thar irons hot, and Merry
> Christmas to all !!
>
> Dave.
> --
> David W. Johnson Power is no substitute for skill
> Amateur Extra WA4NID QRP ARCI 6546
> email: djohnson@acpub.duke.edu G-QRP 4864
> packet WA4NID@KB4WGA.NC.USA.NA NorCal 355
>

From owner-qrp-1@netcom.com Sat Dec 17 14:11:29 1994
From: jwp@chemical-eng.edinburgh.ac.uk
Date: Sat, 17 Dec 94 15:35:13 GMT
Message-Id: <29654.9412171535@aith.chemeng.ed.ac.uk.chemeng.ed.ac.uk>
Subject: Re: balunless Clark and G5RV

I use a 'full size' G5RV on all bands, like Clark without a balun and just a very short coax section (it's easier to feed coax thro' a window than twin lead). It works pretty well on all bands including 160m where it's not supposed to work.

There's no balun because I read somewhere that this is not recommended for the G5RV. You certainly don't want a 4:1 balun, because the idea isn't to match the 300ohm feeder, this is meant to radiate.

You MUST use a tuner, except on 20m where the antenna just about matches. I use an unbalanced (since it's feeding coax) pi-net which matches to better than 1.5:1 SWR except on 160 where it's 2:1. I've experimented with Z-matches. These are OK but seem to have limited matching capability, and also limited coverage unless you switch coils. (Though you can make a very neat qrp Z-match with a single T50 toroid and a couple of ex-bc radio variable caps, to cover 40m up to 10m.)

Jack, gm0rwu

From owner-qrp-l@netcom.com Sun Dec 18 00:12:07 1994
Date: Sat, 17 Dec 1994 18:39:01 -0700 (MST)
From: Rick Zabrodski <zabrodsk@med.ucalgary.ca>
Subject: Re: balunless Clark and G5RV
Message-Id: <Pine.SUN.3.91.941217183534.16990D-100000@ume>

Mr. G5RV states quite clearly NOT to use a balun in the article published in the ARRL Antenna Compendium.

If you have an old boat anchor (ie, tubes and PI network) a tuner is not necessary. I used a G5RV and a DRAKE TR4C without a tuner for several years in the early eighties.....no problemo and finals still work!

Dr. Rick Zabrodski BSc, MD, CCFP(E) * VE6GK
Email: zabrodsk@med.ucalgary.ca * NorCal 519 ARCI 7099 GQRP 8329
Phone 403-271-5123 Fax 403-225-1276 * "Power is no substitute for skill"

On Sat, 17 Dec 1994 jwp@chemical-eng.edinburgh.ac.uk wrote:

> I use a 'full size' G5RV on all bands, like Clark without a balun and
> just a very short coax section (it's easier to feed coax thro' a window
> than twin lead). It works pretty well on all bands including 160m
> where it's not supposed to work.
>
> There's no balun because I read somewhere that this is not recommended for
> the G5RV. You certainly don't want a 4:1 balun, because the idea isn't
> to match the 300ohm feeder, this is meant to radiate.
>
> You MUST use a tuner, except on 20m where the antenna just about matches.
> I use an unbalanced (since it's feeding coax) pi-net which matches to
> better than 1.5:1 SWR except on 160 where it's 2:1. I've experimented with
> Z-matches. These are OK but seem to have limited matching capability, and also

> limited coverage unless you switch coils. (Though you can make a very neat qrp
> Z-match with a single T50 toroid and a couple of ex-bc radio variable caps,
> to cover 40m up to 10m.)
>
> Jack, gm0rwu
>

From owner-qrp-1@netcom.com Sat Dec 17 01:54:23 1994
From: JEVERHART@cayman.vf.ge.com
Date: Fri, 16 Dec 1994 22:41:34 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <941216224134.216374f0@cayman.vf.ge.com>
Subject: Clandestine operation

Quite a bit of QRP hamming falls in the category of portable, quickly set up stations and even some fixed operation is "stealthy". Both categories of operation bear some resemblance to "spy radio" operation that took place during WW2 and other recent wars.

Is there anything we hams can learn from those clandestine operations? Many were QRP class, had hastily assembled antennae and more-or-less portable rigs. Anybody know more about those radios, their antennas and tuners, and, particularly, what frequencies they used?

Anybody know of any good books on the subject?

Just some Friday night ruminations.

72/73,

Joe E. N2CX

From owner-qrp-1@netcom.com Sat Dec 17 04:48:16 1994
Date: Sat, 17 Dec 1994 00:10:43 -0800 (PST)
From: Alan Kaul <kaul@netcom.com>
Subject: Re: Clandestine operation
Message-Id: <Pine.3.89.9412162322.A13708-01000000@netcom6>

Joe, et al.

I have had in my possession since 1963 an alleged WW2 'spy receiver.' I don't know who the manufacturer was, but it is a small box about 3.5 x 4.5 x 9.5 (inches) containing a dual-bander. Low tunes about 2.4 MHz to about 6.3 MHz and the hi band tunees 6.2 to 16.3 MHz. Circuit is a superhet with 5 Loctal tubes (3 7V7, 1 7F7 and 1 7Q7. I think the IF is at 455 kHz and the controls include a volume, bandswitch, tuning, BFO on-off, and pilot light on-off. There's a headphone jack (1/4"), ground and antenna terminals (both are one conductor screw type with plastic knob), and three wires emerging for power (B+ 120v, filament and ground). The box is painted black and the receiver has the

marking "SSR-1-G" in yellow matching the dial inscriptions, plus what appears to be a serial number (G115). Anyone have any ideas about whether or not it is the QRP Spy Radio's Joe referred to? An Old Timer gave it to me, insisting he got it surplus after WW2, and that it had been an OSS radio receiver! Receiver still works, bandspread is a little tough, and it isn't very stable, but it will dig out CW nicely on 80-40. 20 is not too sensitive. Any ideas from out there????

[<Alan Kaul, W6RCL>] kaul@netcom.com

From owner-qrp-1@netcom.com Sat Dec 17 02:23:41 1994
From: JEVERHART@cayman.vf.ge.com
Date: Fri, 16 Dec 1994 15:06:03 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <941216150603.2163e5ba@cayman.vf.ge.com>
Subject: Re: Critters!/30 meters

1. I don't have anything to say about critters other than a sidenote from the news. My family visited So. Cal. this year for vacation, and took a side trip to Tijuana. Among the other tourist goodies there were stuffed painted armadillos (who the H___ whats one of them?) Anyway, several weeks after we returned home, our government issued a warning on those armadillos from Mexico. Seems they were painted with a lead-based paint. How or why would one ever ingest one of those things?

Now the QRP content.

2. Chuck, you said

<STUFF DELETED>

> Someone give us a report on 30M. Whoever spends their time
> QRP'ing up there in the UV band. :-) Relative to 40M that is.
> In fact YOU set up a contest on that band and run it..... :-)

Well, I've spent a little time on the band and love it. A couple of years ago I put together a W7EL rig for 30 meters and it's currently my only rig for that band. My first QSO was with a New Brunswick station (VE1). Not dx, but had a great QSO with my 1 watt. Probably close to 1000 mi/watt on my first try.

The folks there are pretty friendly and you don't have to contend with the KW+ guys.

Dave Ingram K4TWJ, CQ magazine and QRP book author extolls the virtues of 30 meters for portable and mobile operation. I've done both, finding that antenna size is more manageable on 30 as a half wave is only 44 feet, compared to 66

feet for 40 meters.

Propagation is claimed to be a cross between 20 and 40 meters. Maybe so, but I have yet to work any dx other than VEs. BTW, recently the MUF has been so low, however at night, that 30 meters is not too usable much after dark except for very local stuff. In fact, even 40 meters at times is marginal.

Occupancy is not nearly as high as the other bands. In fact, sometimes you wonder if your antenna is connected. You can always check this out by tuning to the middle of the band where there's usually a commercial FSK station (who is it?). And above 10.140 there's almost always packet racket. The lack of occupancy puts some folks off, but I see it as a benefit. I can always leave the rx on 30 meters while I'm homebrewing without worrying about a morass of junk to bother me. And, if I hear something interesting, I fire up the TX and operate for a while. Doing this on 40 meters would be hard on the ears.

Last point: A real plus for 30 meters and all of the WARC bands is that contests are not allowed. This means that you can ragchew or whatever there when the other "low" bands are cluttered with QRO contesters. It also means, Chuck that contests per se are off limits. Perhaps a 30 meter Fox Hunt could be considered a "special operating event" rather than a contest.

Try it, you'll like it

72/73,

Joe E. N2CX

From owner-qrp-l@netcom.com Sat Dec 17 11:57:48 1994
Date: Sat, 17 Dec 1994 10:23:51 -0330 (NST)
From: Robert Gobrick <bgobrick@random.ucs.mun.ca>
Subject: Re: Critters!/30 meters
Message-Id: <Pine.3.87.9412171051.D28229-0100000@random.ucs.mun.ca>

I agree with Joe N2CX that 30 meters is a GREAT little band for QRPers and I also think we should run "special event" fox hunts on 30 meters - heck we have all those 30-40, OHR etc 30 meter rigs around.

I think the trick for the QRP-L fox hunt is the time - 30 meters lately goes "dead" after dark. So if folks would schedule around the grey line sunset hours it may be feasible. The propagation would favor the moving grey line. Maybe we could come up with a "tag-team" fox hunt where the East Coast / Mid Continent / West Coast foxes pass the "key" depending on the hour.

Anyway just a thought for the New Year fox hunt "special events".

72 Bob V01DRB/WA6ERB

Heck the only thing that I work on 30 meter QRP during the gray line passing is the Caribbean, Africa and maybe some East Coasters - sigh...

From owner-qrp-1@netcom.com Sat Dec 17 23:35:40 1994
Date: Sat, 17 Dec 1994 19:40:26 -0500 (EST)
From: CEBIK@utkvx.utk.edu
Subject: FAQ info
Message-Id: <01HKRF7VG09E935FD0@utkvx.utk.edu>

By now, thanks to postings, everyone is aware that N8ET maintains a listing of QRP clubs and AF4K maintains a very complete list of building materials sources. I hope net members will send them all additions and corrections.

I also hope that both will post their lists periodically, perhaps with updated information starred for easy reference.

One category missing from the information collection is available publications (journals, magazines, series, etc.), with data on the general scope of content, cost, and where to subscribe. The list might overlap the club list a bit, but that is ok. It might also include non-QRP journals with content that helps the QRP builder or operator. If someone has such a list, posting it might be a big help to newer net members.

I wonder what other categories of information might be of use to net members.

I have also learned that many types of internet mail services do not automatically contain return addresses. Hence, good practice is to close something like this:

-73-
LB, W4RNL
cebik@utkvx.utk.edu

From owner-qrp-1@netcom.com Sat Dec 17 03:47:13 1994
Subject: Hands 6 Band SSB/CW xcvr
From: brian.carling@acenet.com (Brian Carling)
Message-Id: <2a6.5033.500@acenet.com>
Date: Fri, 16 Dec 1994 22:29:00 -0500

>From: brian.carling@acenet.com

AA4XX writes:

AA> Has anybody out there built the Hands multiband xcvr? The
AA> literature is intriguing even if the rig is a bit on the pricey side.
AA> I'm not aware of any other kits that offer 4-6 band ssb/cw capability.
AA> Any suggestions?
AA> 72 de Paul

Hi there Paul! What is this "Hands" rig? Do you have the address
and/or phone number off the literature about this? I'd like to look
into it. Also, I maintain a list of where to buy QRP kits etc.
So please, Paul and anyone else reading this, send me info about any
new sources of kits, QRP rigs, parts etc.
Thanks & 72 de AF4K/3

brian.carling@acenet.com

~ SLMR 2.1a ~ Don't be sexist! Chicks hate that...

From owner-qrp-1@netcom.com Sat Dec 17 02:05:45 1994
From: rohrwerk@holonet.net
Date: Fri, 16 Dec 1994 20:59:34 -0800
Message-Id: <199412170459.UAA28768@holonet.net>
Subject: RE: LC Filters

On 12-15-94 LVE@inel.gov wrote to qrp-1@netcom.com:

> I also built a W9GR DSP filter kit -- the skirts of this unit's CW
> filter are steeper than the LC filter, but it is not as quiet (some
> digital noise is present).

When Rick wrote his R2 articles, claiming audio dynamic range approaching a CD,
I thought immediately that someday someone should come up with a DSP filter
based on HIGHER-QUALITY DSP's than the W9GR and its relatives. Why shouldn't
we use the DSP's that are now found in sound cards, various computer peripheral
boards, etc., etc.?

Probably because they cost more, and some folks don't see the benefit. Well, I
for one would love it; it would be the only way to get more flexible filtering
in the R2 without degrading the audio.

: John Seboldt	rohrwerk@holonet.net /	I am Bach of Borg...
: Amateur radio	K0JD... /	your style will be
: Church of the	Annunciation, /	assimilated.
: Minneapolis	/	

-> Alice4Mac 2.3 E QWK Eval:05Mar94

From owner-qrp-l@netcom.com Sat Dec 17 02:26:52 1994
From: rohrwerk@holonet.net
Date: Fri, 16 Dec 1994 20:59:32 -0800
Message-Id: <199412170459.UAA28765@holonet.net>
Subject: Mica Insulators

On 12-14-94 rirons@eis.calstate.edu wrote to qrp-l@netcom.com:

>
> Hooray! Got R2 working on 40 m. What a kick to have DC audio and
> single-signal reception! Can't stop tuning around to hear the rich
> variation in CW notes and SSB audio quality.

Absolutely stunning, indeed.

> Question: Who supplies mica insulators (and heat resistant, non-
> conducting hardware) for heat sinks? I'd really like to heat sink the
> R2 audio transistors to the chassis, but one of them needs to be
> insulated from ground, and Campbell suggests using mica. Also, mica
> insulators are recommended for heat sinking the RF power transistors
> in the Hands Electronics linear I'm going to build for T2. Is there
> some readily available substitute?
>

I'm sure even Rat Shack sells various semiconductor mounting kits, including the wafer, screws, and insulated washer for various transistor configurations. My local electronics house carries them; almost all the major outfits.

Mica has been the standard; but there are also some silicone wafers that don't need heat conductive grease. Check your catalogs.

: John Seboldt rohrwerk@holonet.net / I am Bach of Borg...
: Amateur radio K0JD... / your style will be
: Church of the Annunciation, / assimilated.
: Minneapolis /

-> Alice4Mac 2.3 E QWK Eval:05Mar94

From owner-qrp-l@netcom.com Sat Dec 17 03:12:36 1994
From: JEVERHART@cayman.vf.ge.com
Date: Fri, 16 Dec 1994 15:18:52 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <941216151852.2163e5ba@cayman.vf.ge.com>
Subject: Re: Missed the FOX

Guys, were we listening to the same band?

I listened for the FOX the other night and never heard a peep (bark?) from him either. However, I never heard another qrp-l'er. I heard several 0-land

stations, a couple of 6s, the ever-present 5s and even a VE2 in addition to the usual foreign broadcast crud. I scanned 7110 to 7120 for over an hour, starting at 0245.

Didn't hear '5F0, '6ULU, '4EL or any other familiar callsigns. The far out stuff was all I could hear on both my low angle vertical and (hopefully) high angle low dipole. Same luck as I have trying to hear the 40 meter SEN.

Steve AB4EL's idea about other Inetters working each other on fox nights is a good one. Maybe with more known activity, I'll hear some of you 8-).

72/73,

Joe E. N2CX

From owner-qrp-1@netcom.com Sat Dec 17 19:58:08 1994
Date: 17 Dec 94 14:27:21 EST
From: Craig LaBarge <74740.3166@compuserve.com>
Subject: Re: Missed the FOX (fwd)
Message-Id: <941217192720_74740.3166_EHB117-1@CompuServe.COM>

Joe, N2CX wrote:

> I listened for the FOX the other night and never heard a peep (bark?) from
> him
> either. However, I never heard another qrp-1'er. I heard several 0-land
> stations, a couple of 6s, the ever-present 5s and even a VE2 in addition to
> the usual foreign broadcast crud. I scanned 7110 to 7120 for over an hour,
> starting at 0245.
>
> Didn't hear '5F0, '6ULU, '4EL or any other familiar callsigns. The far out
> stuff was all I could hear on both my low angle vertical and (hopefully)
< high
> angle low dipole. Same luck as I have trying to hear the 40 meter SEN.

I thought it was just me. I had about the same results. I chalked up not hearing N2IPY due to just being too close for night-time 40 meters. However, 40 meters (after dark) has not been very good to me lately, even when band conditions seem to be great for everyone else. I guess I can probably chalk that up to my makeshift antenna having too high of a take-off angle on 40 meters or something. Oh well...given my rinky-dink setup and the generally noisy conditions here, I'm lucky I can contact anyone! But, then again, I did work Slovenia on 40 meters with the rainspout a few weeks ago... Go figure!

My last stint as the Fox was a little disappointing, so I'm scouting out some locations for a portable operation next time. Maybe with a real antenna I'll have better luck!

For now, I'll continue to chase the foxes as best I can with what I got.

chirp chirp [Sorry Chuck, bad power supply here... :-)]

73, Craig WB3GCK

From owner-qrp-1@netcom.com Sat Dec 17 02:40:48 1994
From: Mike.Czuhajewski@hambbs.wb3ffv.ampr.org (Mike Czuhajewski)
Subject: Re: New tuning for hw8
Date: Sat, 17 Dec 94 00:03:58 EST5EDT
Message-Id: <1994Dec17.000358.4511@wb3ffv.ampr.org>

Put in another air variable cap if you can find one which will fit, mechanically. The capacitance isn't THAT critical, as long as it's close, as you can compensate for that (although you might have to make a new dial scale). I think it's generally agreed by everyone that use of a varicap in anything is a compromise with regard to stability, as they have relatively poor temperature stability. If you have a choice between a varicap and air variable (make that a good quality air variable), the best bet is to go with the "real" cap. 73 and Queue Our Pea DE WA8MCQ

--

Mike Czuhajewski, user of the UniBoard System @ wb3ffv.ampr.org
E-Mail: Mike.Czuhajewski@hambbs.wb3ffv.ampr.org
The WB3FFV Amateur Radio BBS - Located in Baltimore, Maryland USA
Supporting the Amateur Radio Hobby, and TCP/IP InterNetworking

From owner-qrp-1@netcom.com Sat Dec 17 02:32:15 1994
From: Mike.Czuhajewski@hambbs.wb3ffv.ampr.org (Mike Czuhajewski)
Subject: Re Newgroup/List vote
Date: Fri, 16 Dec 94 23:57:34 EST5EDT
Message-Id: <1994Dec16.235734.4511@wb3ffv.ampr.org>

No results yet, as the votes continue to trickle in. As I said in the call for a vote, this is totally unscientific and completely invalid from a statistical viewpoint, and for fun only and totally nonbinding. By the way, speaking of the unscientific-ness, I just realized this morning that the vote truly IS hopelessly skewed--we have had a large number of people already leave the QRP list due to the amount of traffic, and their votes, if they would have bothered to vote, would most probably have been for a newsgroup. However, since they have already left they could not respond to the vote; in essence, the composition of the list would thus tend to be more along the lines of people who like the list, and many of those who find a list unappealing for some reason have already left and cannot make their voice heard. With that in mind, the voting trend so far is in favor of the list but

not by that much--at last count it was something like 3 to 2 on the side of the mailing list. And someone was kind enough to send me some very long files of info on how to go about submitting something for a newsgroup...just in case... 73 and Queue Our Pea DE WA8MCQ

--

Mike Czuhajewski, user of the UniBoard System @ wb3ffv.ampr.org
E-Mail: Mike.Czuhajewski@hambbs.wb3ffv.ampr.org
The WB3FFV Amateur Radio BBS - Located in Baltimore, Maryland USA
Supporting the Amateur Radio Hobby, and TCP/IP InterNetworking

From owner-qrp-l@netcom.com Sat Dec 17 10:25:32 1994
Date: Sat, 17 Dec 94 06:46:31 -0600
From: adams@chuck.dallas.sgi.com (chuck adams)
Message-Id: <9412171246.AA18153@chuck.dallas.sgi.com>
Subject: NorCal 40

Gang,

I got a NorCal 40 coming. I might build two, but I doubt it.
So many kits - so little time.

dit dit
Chuck Adams K5FO CP-60 adams@sgi.com

From owner-qrp-l@netcom.com Sat Dec 17 17:42:15 1994
Date: Sat, 17 Dec 1994 11:02:24 -0800 (PST)
From: Steven Wilson <randyw@crl.com>
Subject: QRP Philosophy
Message-Id: <Pine.SUN.3.91.941217105037.4844A-1000000@crl4.crl.com>

We need to improve our QRP Philosophy for improved performance in this phase of our amateur radio hobby.

Today, with the many Kilowatt stations on the bands, one often forgets that not so many years ago; it was common for both low power CW and SSB stations to make many QSO's on the ham bands. After 40 years of operating on the bands with one watt to a full blown kilowatt, I believe it is safe to say the two items that are the most important are the antenna and receiver.

Yes, that simple piece of wire we call an antenna is more important than the power input to the transmitter. The antenna requires current to flow into it. Should be in the clear and not touching trees, buildings, etc. I am not sure when the first SWR meter for amateur radio was placed on the market, but I do not remember seeing one until the mid sixties which

was about ten years after I obtained my license. We use to use #47 lamps with a small coil in parallel or the lamp from your dad's flashlight to check on powering the antenna. A least one ham in town had a RF current meter from a WWII transmitter he used to check on the power to the wire. Today "most" QRP'ers understand the need for a decent antenna.

However, many still operate their home stations like portables in the middle of a jungle when it come to receiving. Just because you run QRP does not require you to use a sub-standard receiver. Instead of spending your efforts on a low sensitivity and poorly selective, low audio powered home brew receiver. Spend the same effort on building up a good QSK switching system with a quality xmit/receive switch for your existing commercial ham band receiver. If you do not have a good receiver, check the next hamfest a lot of good ones around cheap i.e. the Drake 2B and R4 series. If you can not hear them you can not work them. Why handicap yourself? It is possible to work the world with very low power if you can hear the other station I am amazed at how many QRP stations can not hear others calling them. Try it, you may find the QRP phase of our hobby more enjoyable with a change in philosophy about the receiver.

One man's opinion. de stan ak0b

From owner-qrp-l@netcom.com Sat Dec 17 16:25:50 1994
Date: Sat, 17 Dec 1994 10:02:17 -0800 (PST)
From: "Henry B. Smith" <hbs@crl.com>
Subject: Re: Re Newgroup/List vote
Message-Id: <Pine.SUN.3.91.941217095913.12205A-100000@crl5.crl.com>

I have been following the qrp-l list for about two weeks now and have really been enjoying it. Frankly I like having the mail in my mailbox everyday because I know that it pertains to something that I am interested in.

I would like to put my two cents worth in about creating a news group.

I can understand that some folks can have problems sifting through the list mail to get to the "legit" mail so I will address that later.

However, my main concern about making this a news group is that it would be too easy to access. Now, before I appear too elitist, let me explain.

By making the qrp-l list available to the entire usenet community you leave yourself available for postings by anybody who can operate a keyboard. Anybody who can access a news group can post to the news group regardless whether he is interested in the content or not.

Having been on the internet for some time now, I know that you will get

unrelated postings, some of which are commercial in nature and some of which are infamatory in nature.

Since this list consists of folks who are mildly to wildly interested in qrp, those who want to respond to it must first subscribe to it. This extra step cuts down on a lot of the unrelated postings by non-interested people.

So, if you dont want bill boards cropping up in your back yard, dont live on the super highway.

Now for the "tons" of email problem.

If you are using a Unix machine, such as I am, then perhaps you can use the "filter" program.

The purpose of the filter program is to filter mail and do things with it. One of these things is to put certain mail into a separate folder. I use filter to put my qrp-l mail into a folder called qrp-l-in and I can then check that folder separately. I do this for all of my mail lists.

It is fairly simple to do, you dont have to spend any money and it works.

Unless the group insists, I wont post the particulars about "filter", but I will email the list of simple instructions upon the request of anyone.

I am at hbs@crl.com.

I hope that this helps,

Smitty, NA5K

From owner-qrp-l@netcom.com Sat Dec 17 16:42:11 1994
From: David Johnson <djohnson@acpub.duke.edu>
Message-Id: <199412171757.MAA18422@carr3.acpub.duke.edu>
Subject: Robert Gobrick - watch it!
Date: Sat, 17 Dec 1994 12:57:20 -0500 (EST)

Robert - what was that about East Coasters ? Watch it ;-)

You sent email to me about keeping you posted on z-match work, but your message, as well as those to qrp-l list, don't give a return email address. What gives?

oblig qrp : I'd like to get involved in more 30m activity. It is a great band! But also, I've noticed more activity on 160m lately, and want to rack up some more qsos there.

Guess the main problem is finding the time. Maybe I should get away from these blasted computers!

One more qrp-related item, only because I will be using it with my qrp rigs: I got the Idiom Press Super CMOS Keyer II built (well, except for the key line and plug) and it is, in A WORD, #\$\$#\$\$% AWESOME #\$\$#\$\$%. Finally an iambic keyer with MEMORIES that I can use for all occasions. Going back and forth from the Bel-Tek (noniambic) memory keyer and the Curtis chip keyers was hurting my brain, and confusing for people on the other end too !! I think \$50 for this thing is a reasonable, no make that a GOOD, deal !! Check it out!

Everybody enjoy Christmas time, and be sure to do at least a little low-power hamming! Listen for me on 40, 160, and 30 for sure!

Dave.

--

David W. Johnson	Power is no substitute for skill
Amateur Extra WA4NID	QRP ARCI 6546
email: djohnson@acpub.duke.edu	G-QRP 4864
packet WA4NID@KB4WGA.NC.USA.NA	NorCal 355

From owner-qrp-1@netcom.com Sat Dec 17 02:53:31 1994
Date: Fri, 16 Dec 1994 23:02:44 -0500 (EST)
From: Philip Russell Specht <specht@america.net>
Subject: subscribe
Message-Id: <Pine.SV4.3.91.941216230131.17981B-100000@atl1.america.net>

subscribe qrp-1

From owner-qrp-1@netcom.com Sun Dec 18 00:08:30 1994
Date: Sat, 17 Dec 1994 18:34:28 -0700 (MST)
From: Rick Zabrodski <zabrodski@med.ucalgary.ca>
Subject: Z match availble commercially
Message-Id: <Pine.SUN.3.91.941217181903.16990C-100000@ume>

There is a commerical Z match tuner available from:
S.E.M.
8 FORT WILLIAM, DOUGLAS
ISLE OF MAN

Telephone: (0624) 662131

(The above is correct.....this is an island off of england.)

It is capable of the UK legal limit easily but I would not try the typical californian kilowatt (Is this warning really necessary here?)

It will match conventional coax and work as an end fed as well.
Size approx 4" by 9" by 7" deep.

It works as advertised. This is a VERY common tuner on the other side of the pond, people! In moose bucks, it was fairly pricey when I bought it a few years back. I like my home brew link coupled antenna better....its easier to tune. The Z match will match almost anything though, including open wire not attached to a real antenna!

Oh yea, it is well built but has no provisions for more than one antenna. Therefore...you supply the SWR/power meter and coax switch if required.

Anybody have a old johnson match box they want to part with.....I don't own one of those....yet.

Cheers and seasons greetings.....have a happy, healthy new year!

```
*****
Dr. Rick Zabrodski BSc, MD, CCFP(E)          *                VE6GK
Email: zabrodsk@med.ucalgary.ca              * NorCal 519  ARCI 7099  GQRP 8329
Phone 403-271-5123 Fax 403-225-1276          * "Power is no substitute for skill"
*****
```

On Sat, 17 Dec 1994, Robert Gobrlick wrote:

```
> Hi Dave - saw your comments on the Z-match antenna tuner - after reading
> some of Bill Orr's columns in CQ recently the Z-match looked
> interesting. I was wondering where you got your info to build one? Also
> I see there is an outfit (I think in Southern US) selling a commercial
> version of the Z-match - first I've seen. Have you heard anyone using
> it? I always keep saying to myself that there MUST be some loss through
> my MFJ tuner when I use it's internal 4:1 balun at QRP work and either an
> old Johnson Viking Matchbox or the Z-match would be a better way to go
> considering they are more "closely coupled" to the 450 ohm balanced feedline.
>
> It seems your experiments so far with the Z-match doesn't prove that out
> yet. Anyway I'd like to keep posted on your progress. Any efficiency
> improvement in the antenna system will help out my 6 element balanced
> feedline 40 meter yagi... ;-) when using it QRP.
>
> 72 and thanks Bob V01DRB/WA6ERB
>
>
```